

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/GB2004/001457

International filing date (day/month/year)
02.04.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
04.04.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G07D5/08, G07F1/04

Applicant
MONEY CONTROLS LIMITED

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Bohn, P

Telephone No. +31 70 340-3962



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/GB2004/001457

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/GB2004/001457

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-6,13-15
	No: Claims	7-12
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	2,13-15
	No: Claims	1,3-12
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-15
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

1 The following documents are referred to in this communication:

D1: EP-A-0 704 825 (LANDIS & GYR TECH INNOVAT) 3 April 1996 (1996-04-03)

D2: US-B-6 173 8261 (FURNEAUX DAVID MICHAEL) 16 January 2001 (2001-01-16)

D3: WO 01/59714 A (HARRIS JEFFREY ALUN ; CHURCHMAN JAMES (GB);
SHARMAN DARREN (GB); TETRA) 16 August 2001 (2001-08-16)

D4: GB-A-2 169 429 (COIN CONTROLS) 9 July 1986 (1986-07-09)

D5: WO 99/23615 A (COIN CONTROLS ; WOOD DENNIS (GB)) 14 May 1999 (1999-05-14)

D6: US-A-4 821 863 (OKADA KAZUO) 18 April 1989 (1989-04-18)

D7: CA-A-2 293 767 (CASHCODE COMPANY INC) 24 June 2001 (2001-06-24)

2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

Document D1 discloses a coin acceptor (col.2 l.26-46) comprising a coin sensing station (references numerals 9 and 11), a coin rundown path extending through the sensing station (reference numeral 1), the path including a coin guiding surface on which a major face of the coin lies in sliding engagement during its passage along the path through the sensing station.

The difference between the coin acceptor of document D1 and the subject-matter of claim 1 consists of a curved path.

This is a construction detail that the skilled person would select, in accordance with circumstances, without the exercise of inventive skill, in order to direct the coin to a specific destination (see for example document D6, fig. 3).

The subject-matter of claim 1 does therefore not involve an inventive step.

3 DEPENDENT CLAIM 2

The combination of the features of dependent claim 2 are neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the available prior art.

Document D1 discloses side walls that are inclined to the vertical in order to assure that the coin stays in sliding engagement during its passage along the coin sensing station (col.2 l.26-46).

No prior art document discloses a coin rundown path curved such that a major face of the coin is urged by centripetal force against the coin guiding surface as it moves through the sensing station.

This provides an alternative solution to the problem of avoiding space between the coin and the sensors along a coin rundown path.

4 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 3-6

When dependent on claim 1, dependent claims 3-6 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

5 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 7

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 7 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D2 discloses a coin acceptor (col.3 l.39-60 and fig. 2a) comprising a coin sensing station (references numerals 1, 2, 3), a coin rundown path extending through the sensing station (reference numeral 4) and sensor coils at the coin sensing station (reference numerals 1, 2, 3), one of said coils comprising an elongate winding extending longitudinally along the coin rundown path (reference numeral 3). The subject-matter of claim 7 is therefore not new.

6 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 8-12

Dependent claims 8-12 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).

7 INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 13-14

The subject-matter of claims 13 and 14 includes a coin acceptor comprising a coin sensing station, a coin rundown path extending through the sensing station, the path including a curved coin guiding surface on which a major face of the coin lies in sliding engagement during its passage along the path through the sensing station.

These features correspond substantially to the features of claim 2.

The subject-matter of claims 13 and 14 therefore meets the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step (see item 3).

8 Claim 15 is dependent on claim 14 and as such also meets the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.

9 Although claims 1, 7, 13 and 14 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought and in respect of the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☒ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☒ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☒ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.